

The examiner complains about claim 1, line 3 wherein it states "being an upper profile and ... lower profiles. Again, the examiner is referred to the specification and drawings. In particular, the examiner is requested to consult the top of page 8 wherein it states "The lower profiles of the ribs 242 have a longitudinal radius 247 which approximates the radius of a large orange or grapefruit. An upper profile of the primary ribs 248 will also make contact with large fruit but must also allow for the efficient juicing of limes, small oranges and lemons. In this example, the upper rib profile is characterised by an upper longitudinal radius 249 that is greater than the lower longitudinal radius 247".

The Applicant's representative queries whether or not the examiner has actually read the specification and considered the drawings.


The claims are rejected on the basis of 35USC103. However, the examiner's primary reference was filed on 13 March 2006 based on a 17 March 2005 French priority document. The Applicant's earliest priority date is 22 October 2003 and the Applicant's latest claim of priority is 1 July 2004.

The Applicant notes the language of the examiner's rejections of the claims under Section 103 and contends that, apart from the document not being prior art, the rejection appears to have total disregard for the content of the Applicant's specification and the specification language used in the Applicant's claims.

It is requested that this application be referred to a Supervisory Patent Examiner for further consideration. It is requested that this Office Action be withdrawn or reissued to give the Applicant the benefit of the standards of examination that apply to all Office Actions issued by USPTO examiners.

Please charge any deficiency in the fees due to our Deposit Account No. 503458 in the name of Molins & Co.

Regards,



Michael Molins
Reg. No. 31785
Customer No. 33372